REMARKS

Claims 11-30 were pending in the above-identified patent application when last examined. The claims are not being amended in this response to the Office Action dated August 13, 2010, but a listing of the claims is provided above for reference. For the following reasons, Applicants request reconsideration of the above-identified patent application and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the August 13, 2010 Office Action.

Claims 11, 13-22, and 24-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,414,635 (Stewart) in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0089528 (Hay). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 11 distinguishes over the combination of Stewart and Hay at least by reciting, "said information access point including apparatus for retrieving information relating to trusted computing platforms located within said pre-determined geographical area, said information system being arranged to provide said information to a portable computing apparatus visiting the pre-determined geographical area." Stewart and Hay fails to disclose or suggest trusted computing platforms or providing information about trusted computed platforms to a visiting device.

Stewart is directed to communication system that provides information to visiting devices based on the geographic location of the visiting device. For example, Stewart discloses providing shopping information to a visitor at a shopping mall. Stewart nowhere discloses or suggests trusted computing platforms or retrieving information from trusted computing platforms.

Hay is directed to a system that provides security information and allows a user to set or change security settings. Hay describes that different types of platforms can be trusted to different degrees (e.g., paragraph [0003] of Hay) and describes a computer system that could contain trusted platform hardware (e.g., paragraph [0060] of Hay).

The combination of Stewart and Hay fails to disclose or suggest an apparatus that retrieves information relating to trusted computing platforms within and geographic area or providing such information to a visiting apparatus. In regard to retrieving information the Office Action cites Stewart col. 3, lines 6-32 and col. 8, lines 9-12, which describe how one or more access points can be used to determine the location of a portable computing device (PCD) and obtain security information from the PCD. The Office Action further indicates

PATENT LAW OFFICE OF
DAVID MILLERS
1221 SUN RIDGE ROAD
PLACERVILLE, CA 95667
PH: (530) 621-4545
FX: (530) 621-4543

that it would have been obvious to "have modified … Stewart to clearly state the portable computing device (PCD) 110 is the trusted computed platform and/or modified Stewart's invention with the teaching of Hay." However, claim 11 further recites, "said information system being arranged to provide said information to a portable computing apparatus visiting the pre-determined geographical area." The flow of information relied upon in the Office Action as suggesting the retrieval of information relating to trusted computing platforms located within said pre-determined geographical area is from the visiting device. There is no suggestion in the combination of Stewart and Hay of information relating to a trusted device flowing to a computing apparatus visiting the geographic area. In particular, Stewart and Hay do not suggest sending information relating to trusted computing platforms to the PCD 110 or any other visiting device. The flow of security information cited in the Office Action is only in one direction. Accordingly, claim 11 is patentable over Stewart and Hay.

Claims 13-20 depend from claim 11 and are patentable over the combination of Stewart and Hay for at least the same reasons that claim 11 is patentable over the combination of Stewart and Hay.

Claim 15 further distinguishes over Stewart and Hay by reciting, "said apparatus for communicating or interacting with the portable computing apparatus is arranged to perform said communication or interaction by physical contact or directional wireless communication." The combination of Stewart and Hay does not suggest a visiting device using contact or directional wireless communication. In regard to claim 15, the Office Action, page 4, section 4.d. cites Stewart, Fig. 1 and column 7, lines 15-31. However, the cited portions of Stewart describe wireless communication (i.e., not contact) that identifies the location of the portable computing device. The communication is not directional since communication is possible from any direction. In accordance with an aspect of Applicants' invention, a visiting user can better trust information received when the user knows the source of the information. Physical contact or directional wireless communication allows a user to identify the information source by human perception/sight, which is not suggested by Stewart or Hay.

Independent claim 21 distinguishes over the combination of Stewart and Hay at least by reciting "retrieving to the information access point information relating to trusted computing platforms within the geographical area; and providing the information from the information access point to a portable computing apparatus visiting the pre-determined geographical area." As noted above, Stewart and Hay fail to disclose or suggest providing

PATENT LAW OFFICE OF
DAVID MILLERS
1221 SUN RIDGE ROAD
PLACERVILLE, CA 95667
PH: (530) 621-4545
FX: (530) 621-4543

information relating to trusted computing platforms to a visiting portable computing apparatus. Accordingly, claim 21 is patentable over Stewart.

Claims 22 and 24-27 depend from claim 21 and are patentable over Stewart and Hay for at least the same reasons that claim 21 is patentable over Stewart and Hay.

Dependent claim 24 further distinguishes over the combination of Stewart and Hay by reciting, "the information access point communicating with the portable computing apparatus when the portable computing apparatus is in physical contact with the information access point." Stewart and Hay do not describe or suggest communicating with a visiting device in physical contact. Applicant notes that Stewart uses the word "contact" to mean communicating, so that a portable computing device remains communicating with the same access point for the duration of a transaction such as renting a car. See col. 16, lines 29-37 of Stewart.

Dependent claim 27 further distinguishes over Stewart and Hay by reciting, "the portable computing apparatus requesting that a verification service verify the information; the verification service verifying identities of the trusted computing platforms, signing results, and returning signed results." Hay is cited for teaching verification and signing. However, the combination of Stewart and Hay provide no indication or suggestion that the information provided, for example, by the access points of Stewart would require verification from a verification service that would sign the results provided to the visiting device.

Independent claim 28 distinguishes over the combination of Stewart and Hay at least by reciting, "an information access point … including an apparatus for retrieving information needed for interaction with trusted components of the trusted computing platforms and an interface arranged to provide the information to a portable computing apparatus visiting the geographical area." For the reasons given above with reference to claims 11 and 21, Stewart and Hay fail to disclose or suggest providing to a visiting device the information needed for interaction with trusted components in a geographical area. Accordingly, claim 28 is patentable over Stewart and Hay.

Claims29 and 30 depend from claim 28 and are patentable over Stewart for at least the same reasons that claim 28 is patentable over Stewart.

PATENT LAW OFFICE OF
DAVID MILLERS
1221 SUN RIDGE ROAD
PLACERVILLE, CA 95667
PH: (530) 621-4545
FX: (530) 621-4543

Claim 29 further distinguishes over Stewart and Hay by reciting, "the interface comprises at least one of a contact reader and a directional wireless communication interface through which the portable computing apparatus can communicate with the information

access point." Stewart and Hay fail to disclose or suggest an access point having either a contact reader or a directional wireless interface.

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 12 and 23were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Stewart in view of Hay and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,937,066 (Gennaro). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 12 and 23 respectively depend from claims 11 and 21, which are patentable over Stewart and Hay for at least the reasons given above. In particular, Stewart and Hay fail to disclose or suggest providing information relating to trusted computing platforms in a geographic area to a visiting device to enable interactions with the trusted computing platforms. Gennaro is directed to cryptographic key recovery and in that context, discloses transmission of public keys. However, Gennaro like Stewart and Hay does not describe or address ways to enable a visiting portable computer to interact with local trusted computing platforms. Accordingly, the above reasoning used to show that claims 11 and 21 are patentable over Stewart and Hay also applies to the combination of Stewart, Hay, and Gennaro, and claims 12 and 23 are patentable over the combination of Stewart, Hay, and Gennaro for at least the same reasons that their respective base claims 11 and 21 are patentable over Stewart and Gennaro.

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In summary, claims 11-30 were pending in the application and remain in the form previously examined. For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application including claims 11-30.

Respectfully submitted,

/David Millers 37396/

David Millers
Reg. No. 37,396

PATENT LAW OFFICE OF
DAVID MILLERS
1221 SUN RIDGE ROAD
PLACERVILLE, CA 95667
PH: (530) 621-4545
FX: (530) 621-4543